## 

1	Robert F. McCauley (SBN 162056)		
2	robert.mccauley@finnegan.com Arpita Bhattacharyya (SBN 316454)		
3	arpita.bhattacharyya@finnegan.com Jeffrey D. Smyth (SBN 280665)		
4	jeffrey.smyth@finnegan.com FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,		
5	GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP 3300 Hillview Avenue		
	Palo Alto, California 94304		
6	Telephone: (650) 849-6600 Facsimile: (650) 849-6666		
7 8	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterdefendant ASETEK DANMARK A/S		
9			
10	UNITED STATES I		
11	NORTHERN DISTRIC SAN FRANCIS		
12			
13	ASETEK DANMARK A/S	CASE NO. 3:19-c	v-00410-EMC
14	Plaintiff and	ASETEK DANM	IARK A/S'S MOTION
15	Counterdefendant,		) FILE A TWO PAGE Y RE ITS MOTION TO
16	v.		T SYSTEMS, INC.'S
17	COOLIT SYSTEMS, INC.,		PATENT NO. 8,245,764
	Defendant and	п . Б.	N 1 21 2010
18	Counterclaimant.	Hearing Date:	
19		Underlying Motio Submission)	n (Dkt. 52 Under
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

## Case 3:19-cv-00410-EMC Document 88 Filed 12/04/19 Page 2 of 3

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

24

25

26

27

28

Because CoolIT exceeded the Court's permitted scope by raising several new arguments in its surreply to Asetek's Motion to Strike CoolIT's Invalidity Contentions, Asetek respectfully requests leave to file a two page sur-surreply to same (Ex. B hereto). The Court allowed CoolIT to file a surreply of limited scope, to respond to the Basi Declaration "in a factual way" without raising "any new arguments." More specifically, the Court said:

I'm going to allow CoolIT to file a reply in the form of either a declaration or something very specific key to the Basi declaration. *Not any new arguments*. Try to supplement, you know, what it did in a factual way.

But to be fair, if there is something about Dr. Basi's declaration -- for instance, saying that Questel database is a well-known patent search database, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. If there is something to rebut that or counter that or impeach that kind of testimony, I will allow that.

So it's like cross examination. Scope is going to be limited to this surrebuttal, which I'm allowing, to be limited to the scope of the declaration that was introduced on reply by Dr. Basi. I'd like to have that filed in a week.

Ex. A hereto [Hearing Transcript] at 25:2-14.

CoolIT's surreply and supporting Chan Declaration, however, exceeded the Court's limited scope and raised at least the following new arguments:

- (1) That Dr. Basi, as a non-attorney, is supposedly not qualified to testify regarding the scope of a diligent prior art search, even though CoolIT itself previously relied on a declaration from a prior art searcher, Ms. Kelly Bowman, to support its position on the same issue, and even though estoppel cases applying the "diligent search" standard have consistently relied on declarations from prior art searchers—not patent attorneys.
- (2) That searching foreign references is supposedly atypical or not required under the "diligent search" test, and that a search limited to "English-language databases" should suffice, even though CoolIT previously asserted that its prior art search was "international." [Dkt. 54, CoolIT's Opp. Brief at 2:20-25, 7:20-24].
- (3) That the Patent Office's granting of CoolIT's reexam request means that its 2012 prior art search was diligent/sufficient, even though in all estoppel cases the PTO necessarily must

## 

1	have initially considered the prior art references as "strong enough" to start the		
2	proceedings.		
3	(4) CoolIT has not provided any testimony or evidence that Questel (or similar databases		
4	with machine translations of foreign-language references) was not available in 2012, and		
5	thus not answered the question specifically posed by the Court in granting leave for the		
6	surreply.		
7	For the above reasons, Asetek respectfully requests leave to file the sur-surreply attached		
8	hereto as Exhibit B.		
9	Respectfully submitted,		
10			
11	Dated: December 4, 2019 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP		
12	GIRRETT & BOTT ER, EEF		
13	By: <u>/s/ Arpita Bhattacharyya</u> Arpita Bhattacharyya		
14	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterdefendant ASETEK DANMARK A/S		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26   27			
$\begin{bmatrix} 27 \\ 28 \end{bmatrix}$			
٥ ا			